```
021RBIRc
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
     -----x
 2
3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                V.
                                            23-CR-563-LAK
5
     ROBERT BIRCH,
6
                   Defendant.
                                          Conference
          -----x
 7
 8
                                            New York, N.Y.
                                            February 1, 2024
9
                                            11:00 a.m.
     Before:
10
                         HON. LEWIS A. KAPLAN,
11
                                            District Judge
12
                              APPEARANCES
13
14
     DAMIAN WILLIAMS
          United States Attorney for the
          Southern District of New York
15
     JAMIE BAGLIEBTER
16
          Assistant United States Attorney
17
     LAW OFFICES OF JEFFREY LICHTMAN
         Attorneys for Defendant
18
     BY: JEFFREY HARRIS LICHTMAN
19
20
     ALSO PRESENT: JONATHAN C. LETTIERI, Pretrial
21
22
23
24
25
```

(Case called)

MS. BAGLIEBTER: Good morning, your Honor. Jamie
Bagliebter from the government, and with me at counsel table is
Pretrial Services Officer Jonathan Lettieri.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. LICHTMAN: Jeffrey Lichtman and Jeffrey Einhorn for Robert Birch.

THE COURT: Good morning. I wanted to get a little more understanding of what is going on with the discovery and how it affects this. So I don't want to see the timetable slide, so maybe you can enlighten me, folks.

MS. BAGLIEBTER: Your Honor, I'm happy to begin. Your Honor, as the defense noted in their letter to the Court, the substantial majority of the discovery in this case was produced in December of last year. That involves most of the records in this case, phone records, social media records, Google, iCloud records, and I think, most importantly, the government produced to the defense on December 11, a 4,000-page communication between the minor victim and the defendant, which tracks in many ways the images and videos that underlie the charges in the complaint — I mean, in the indictment. Excuse me.

And we've had discussions with the defense about where the government -- where within the large volume of the discovery the government views some of the most pertinent evidence to help aid them in their efforts. So at this --

```
1
               THE COURT: You know, I'm a little floored when you
 2
      say 4,000 -- did you say word or page?
 3
               MS. BAGLIEBTER:
                               Page.
 4
               THE COURT: Page?
 5
               MS. BAGLIEBTER: Correct.
 6
               THE COURT: What is this, the Encyclopedia Britannica?
 7
               MS. BAGLIEBTER: Your Honor, this was a chat
      communication between the victim and the defendant.
8
9
               THE COURT: I'm sorry, what kind?
10
               MS. BAGLIEBTER: Chat communications.
11
               THE COURT: Oh, chat communication.
12
               MS. BAGLIEBTER: Yes, text message communications that
13
      they had over time. The indictment in the case centers on
14
      incidents that took place on three dates, even though those
15
      three dates are not nearly isolated incidents, but the
      communications that pertain to those dates and the images and
16
17
      videos that correspond to those dates run hundreds and hundreds
18
      of pages.
19
               THE COURT: Didn't they eat or sleep?
20
               MS. BAGLIEBTER: No, your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: I'm not really making light of it.
22
     mean, it's --
23
               MS. BAGLIEBTER: Nor am I. I think over this time
24
     period the abuse that was taking place on, these incidents did
25
      last hours and hours and did involve the deprivation of sleep,
```

and it took place while these communications were happening. So we produced that first to the defense and talked to them about where we found the pertinent communications, and that's because the government and the defense have talked about, sort of, next steps in this case and directing them to the information that is most pertinent seems to be an efficient way for them to assist in providing them the materials that they need to. There are a few items outstanding from the government's perspective, but we have discussed them with the defense, and they're familiar with them; namely, there are some records from the school that are replete with public — with PII relating to a number of minors. And so, we're going to produce those. We've agreed with the defense to produce those attorneys' eyes only, so that we can get out very shortly.

And then, with respect to the devices that contain child sexual abuse material, as the Court is aware, those need to be reviewed at the FBI to be consistent with 18 U.S.C. 3509(m). So we have discussed that with the defense, and it's available for their review at any time. We've also endeavored to segregate as best as we can some amount of those devices that does not include child abuse sexual material. It's not just images. It also requires that we are break any links, hyperlinks, to staff that would access child sexual abuse material. So we've endeavored to do that, and I think we can produce some partial extractions of those devices safely, and

we expect to do that very quickly. And that will just aid the defense by requiring them to spend less time in the government offices reviewing those devices.

THE COURT: So give me a forecast end date.

MS. BAGLIEBTER: So, your Honor, I think within a week or two, those items can be produced. And I'm not aware at this time of any other materials that they would need, any other discoverable materials. And then, of course, the child sexual abuse material, which is really the heart of this case, is and has been available to them since our last conference.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Litchtman, please?

MR. LICHTMAN: Judge, all of that is accurate. You know, you are coming at this not from the place of amount of knowledge that the two parties have because we've been knee deep in this case for months.

THE COURT: Yes, but you are wandering away from the microphone, so I'm not hearing too well.

MR. LICHTMAN: I'm sorry. I apologize. It should be understood from the beginning, this is a case that is straight mitigation. This should be on a path for anything but mitigation to resolve it that way. It's a highly unusual case because of the age of the defendant, who turned 18 just a few months ago, and a lot of relationship occurred before he was 18. In addition, there is such a long and winding road of psychological issues that go back to not just junior high

school but back to almost from when he could walk.

So we've got a number of doctors. We have four doctors that are involved trying to unravel this, because we need to put forth a mitigation package because the conduct -- you've seen it in the indictment -- is so extreme that we need to explain it and try to make sense of it, and also, a path going forward with the defendant.

THE COURT: Well, when you say "mitigation package," with what end in view? I'm not sure what you mean by that exactly.

MR. LICHTMAN: Well, we're in a case right now, Judge, with a 45-year mandatory minimum.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. LICHTMAN: So we're going to be, at the government's invitation, understanding the Draconian punishments with the charges that were filed, they asked us to put together a package for them so that we can try to resolve this case together to some large extent. Obviously, we can't do your job as well, Judge, but in terms of where this case will be going.

THE COURT: A negotiated resolution is what we're talking about?

MR. LICHTMAN: Yes. And there's just so much involved. We have the number of doctors that we have. We have not gone through the pictures, the images. When I tell you

that we're working on this case not just every day, but a good part of the day with a number of lawyers, because there's so much involved. So what I respectfully — what I don't want to have happen, but I'm willing to if your Honor wants it, is I would like to avoid setting a motion schedule because it's really just superfluous and a waste of time for both parties, because it's never — first of all, there's no motions that are so significant because we've consented to nearly every search from when the investigation part began. There was an initial search. We were hired. Every other purported search that was going to be, we consented to, including at the defendant's college. All of that stuff was consented to. So there's not really any kind of significant motion schedule because we're not — we're on the same page. We're working on this together.

So what I'm trying to do is use this time to get all these doctors quickly to get the work done. And as I said, we speak to the doctors not just one time a day, multiple times a day. We're getting through it. We have to bring, perhaps, some of the doctors to look at some of the images with us. We have to go through it, but it's not just to go through it just to see what the evidence is against the defendant. But we have to try to understand how it fits in with the work that they are doing.

So I know the case. It's unusual in that sense, and Judge, you know, we've all had -- every case that we've had

usually is you've got charges. You've got evidence. You make motions, and you either go to trial or you plead. This case is different in a way because we're really working together on this.

THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate the update. I'm going to give you what you asked for. Andy, let's set another date in about two months.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Sure, Judge. Judge, would Tuesday

April 9 at 11:00 a.m. be good.

THE COURT: Work for everybody?

MR. LICHTMAN: I think that will be fine.

MS. BAGLIEBTER: Yes, your Honor.

MR. LICHTMAN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Does the government have a request for an extension of the Speedy Trial Act?

MS. BAGLIEBTER: Yes, your Honor. The government moves the Court to exclude time between now and April 9, so that the parties can continue their discussions about a potential pretrial disposition and so the defense can review the discovery and consider whether any motions should be made.

THE COURT: Is there any objection, Mr. Litchtman?

MR. LICHTMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Time is excluded from now to and including

April 9. I find that the interests of justice served thereby

outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a

speedy trial for the reasons stated by the government and the defense for that matter.

Okay. Thank you. I appreciate you coming down. I just wanted to keep on top of it.

MR. LICHTMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

MS. BAGLIEBTER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

(Adjourned)